MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
14 March 1957

ORDER OF BUSINESS

9:30 a.m. 1. CONVENE, ROOM 7000 INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING.

9:32 a.m. 2. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS.

9:33 a.m. 3. DATE OF NEXT MEETING - April 18, 1957 (?)

9:35 a.m. 4. REPORT OF ACTION TAKEN ON SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT APPLICATIONS SINCE 24 JANUARY 1957 MEETING (See Appendix 1).

9:40 a.m. 5. REPORT OF ACTION TAKEN ON OMNIBUS SHIPSTEAD ACT APPLICATIONS SINCE 24 JANUARY 1957 MEETING (See Appendix 2).

9:45 a.m. 6. EXECUTIVE ORDER STATUS-Conference with National Capital Planning Comm. representatives (Mr. Harland Bartholomew, Chairman; Mr. John A. Nesbon, V. Chairman, Brig. Gen. Thomas A. Lane, member,).

10:30 a.m. 7. NATIONAL MEMORIAL COMMISSION - Five Freedoms Memorial (Mr. R. T. Thompson, Associate Superintendent, NCP; Mr. John Harbeson, architect; Mr. Eric Gugler, architect).

11:00 a.m. 8. AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION SUBMISSION: (Brig. Gen. Thomas North, Secy., ABMC; Mr. Wm. Gehron, architect; Mr. John Harbeson, architect).

(a) East Coast Memorial-revised design & model (Mr. Gehron)

(b) Pershing Memorial-status (Gen. North)

(c) West Coast Memorial-revised design (Mr. Harbeson)

(d) Hawaii Memorial-Main sculptural treatment (Mr. Harbeson)

12:15 p.m. RECESS - PROCEED TO FREER GALLERY OF ART

12:30 p.m. 9. FREER GALLERY OF ART - Inspection of acquisitions.

1:00 p.m. LUNCH IN SECRETARY'S DINING ROOM.

1:55 p.m. RECONVENE, ROOM 7000 INTERIOR DEPT. BLDG.

2:00 p.m. 10. D. C. HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT - Anacostia Freeway Overpass-11th St. Interchange: Mr. Gerard I. Sawyer, Chief, Off. of Planning, Design & Engineering; Mr. Kelly, engineer; Mr. Joseph Torney, architect)

(a) B Street extension.

2:45 p.m. 11. PUBLIC BUILDINGS SERVICE SUBMISSIONS: (Mr. L. L. Hunter, Supervising Arch. PBS; Mr. Hageman, Mr. Phil Wilson, PBS)

(1) Federal Office Bldg. No. 9 - Civil Service Commission (Mr. Schlossman, Mr. Obola, Mr. Bennett, architects)

3:15 p.m. (2) Gallaudet College: (Mr. Benton, Mr. McLeod)

(a) Speech and Hearing Clinic;
(b) Science and Classroom Building.

3:45 p.m. (3) State Department Exterior Courts, Annex (Mr. Bates, State Dept.; Mr. Keenan, Mr. Shirton, Mr. Keasing, architects)

4:15 p.m. 12. LEGISLATION (See Appendix 3).

4:45 p.m. 13. SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT APPLICATIONS-Formal (See Appendix 4)

Recess

8:30 p.m. 14. NATIONAL CAPITAL PARKS, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT: Test of new lighting for Washington Monument at the Monument Grounds.

NOTE: Reconvene at 9:30 a.m., Friday, 15 March 1957, for a joint meeting with members of the Committee on the National Capital, American Institute of Architects, and representatives of the National Capital Planning Commission.

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
15 March 1957

JOINT MEETING WITH MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE NATIONAL CAPITAL, AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS, AND REPRESENTATIVES OF THE NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION

SUBJECTS FOR DISCUSSION:

1. The functions of the Commission of Fine Arts and inquiry into the desirability of making its recommendations more binding:

   (a) Change in basic legislation.

   (b) Change by executive order.

2. Pending legislation of an administrative character:

   (a) The Thompson-Humphrey bills to enlarge the Commission of Fine Arts (H. R. 2512 and S. 965/85th Congress).

   (b) Health, Education and Welfare's Advisory Council on the Arts (H. R. 1945 by Kearns and H. R. 3541 by Thompson).

   (c) Thompson's bill on decorative art in public buildings (H. R. 4004/85th)

   (d) Residence for Vice President.

   (e) Amendment to lease-purchase act.

3. Pending recommendations and legislation regarding the planning function in the District of Columbia.

   (a) Citizens Advisory Committee's Report on the District Commissioner's desire to appoint membership of the National Capital Planning Commission.

   (b) Joint Congressional Planning Committee for the District of Columbia (H. J. Res. 124/85th).

   (c) Need for closer relationship between the Commission of Fine Arts and the National Capital Planning Commission.

4. The inroads of "creeping commercialism" into the federal areas of the capital.

5. Desirability of appointing a panel of architects from the American Institute of Architects to assist the Commission of Fine Art's examination and recommendations on building permits submitted by District Government under the Shipstead-Luce Act.

6. Replacement of present lighting standards with highway type lighting.

7. Review of current District of Columbia problems:

(a) The development of Jackson Place on the west side of Lafayette Park.

(b) The threat of the "inner belt" to the monumental area.

(c) Southwest Redevelopment and the railroad.

(d) Southwest Redevelopment, Area C, and the fallacy of the Tenth Street Mall.

(e) Private encroachment by zoning processes into government taking area:

(1) Northwest rectangle.

(2) Lower Sixteenth Street.

(3) National Association of Life Underwriter's building.

(f) Reply to Albrook article in the Washington Post and Times Herald of 17 February 1957.

(g) Encroachment of Highway Dept. on park reservations on Penna. Avenue between 13th and 14th Streets, N. W.

11:15 a.m. RECESS - Proceed to Freer Gallery of Art.

11:30 a.m. 1. FREER GALLERY OF ART - Inspection of acquisitions.

Index to Minutes
The Commission of Fine Arts
14 March 1957

American Battle Monuments Commission
- a) East Coast Memorial 1
- b) West Coast Memorial 2

Commission of Fine Arts
- a) Executive Order - status 1
- b) Old Georgetown Act submissions 1
- c) Shipstead-Luce Act submissions 1

Freer Gallery of Art 3

General Services Administration
Public Buildings Service
- a) Department of State - exterior courts 3
- b) Federal Office Building #9 2
- c) Gallaudet College
  - 1) Speech and Hearing Clinic 2
  - 2) Science and Classroom Building 3

Government of the District of Columbia
Department of Highways and Traffic
- a) Anacostia Freeway Underpass at 11th St. Interchange 2

National Capital Planning Commission
Coordinating Committee
- a) representation of Commission of Fine Arts 3

National Monuments Commission
- a) Five Freedoms Memorial 1

Condensed Memorandum Minutes
The Commission of Fine Arts
Washington, D. C. 14 March 1957

The Commission met, pursuant to notice, at 9:30 a.m. with David E. Finley, Chairman, presiding.

Present: David E. Finley, Chairman
Felix de Weldon
Wallace Harrison
Mrs. Emily Muir
Douglas W. Orr
Elbert Peets
William G. Perry

L. R. Wilson, Secretary
Susan E. Bennett, Admn. Asst.
Gilbert Halasz, Stenotypist

Minutes of previous meetings

Transcripts of orders of business of previous meetings are being processed and minutes will be circulated as soon as ready.

Date of next meeting

The next meeting date was fixed for April 18, 1957.

Shipstead-Luce Act Submissions

The Shipstead-Luce Act submissions listed on Appendix 1 and Appendix 4 were discussed and approved. Exhibits A and B.

Old Georgetown Act Submissions

The Old Georgetown Act submissions listed on Appendix 2 were discussed and approved. Exhibit C.

The Executive Order-status

The draft of a new Commission of Fine Arts Executive Order was discussed at length, but since there has been no reply from the Bureau of the Budget regarding it, no decision was taken.

National Monument Commission

The proposed Five Freedoms Memorial was discussed in detail with the Associate Superintendent, National Capital Parks, Mr. Harry T. Thompson, and the architects, Mr. John Harbeson and Mr. Erick Gugler. The Commission approved the concept of the Memorial in principle but not in detail, as to architectural form or site.

American Battle Monuments Commission

a) East Coast Memorial

Brig. Gen. Thomas North, Secretary, American Battle Monuments Commission; Mr. John Harbeson, Architect of Harbeson, Hough, Livingston and Larson, Philadelphia; and Mr. William Gehron, Architect of New York, attended the meeting in connection with the presentations for the East Coast Memorial and also the West Coast Memorial.

Mr. Gehron explained in detail the revised design and model of the

East Coast Memorial, which was made in accordance with suggestions of the Commission of Fine Arts at an earlier meeting. Following the discussion, it was moved, seconded and carried that the design, with modifications of scale and putting the eagle in bronze on a wave, be approved, subject to the approval of the Fine Arts Commission of New York City. Exhibit D.

b) West Coast Memorial

Mr. Harbeson explained the revised design of the West Coast Memorial, which incorporated suggestions made by the members of the Commission of Fine Arts at an earlier meeting. The members approved in principle the revised design and asked if a model could be made and submitted to a later meeting of the Commission. It was agreed this would be done. Exhibit E.

Government of the District of Columbia
Department of Highways and Traffic

Anacostia Freeway Underpass at Eleventh Street Interchange

Mr. Gerard I. Sawyer, Chief, Office of Planning, Design and Engineering for the Department, and Mr. Joseph Tormey, Architect of Baltimore, attended the meeting. Mr. Tormey explained the drawings and plans for the underpass, and the members of the Commission, after a full discussion of the details, expressed their satisfaction with the design and approved it. Exhibit F.

General Services Administration
Public Buildings Service

a) Federal Office Building #9-Civil Service Commission

The Public Buildings Service was represented at the meeting by Mr. L.L. Hunter, Supervising Architect, Mr. C.F. Hageman, and Mr. Eugene Witherell. Mr. Norman Schlossman and Mr. Richard M. Bennett of the architectural firm of Loebl, Schlossman and Bennett, and Mr. Gyo Obata of Hellmuth, Obata and Kassabaum, were also present.

Mr. Obata explained the plans and drawings for the new Civil Service Building. He stated there was a great problem involved in designing the building on the site available and at the same time providing the space needed for the occupants. Mr. Hunter asked for additional time to study in particular the height of the building and the size of the court, which had been restricted by the action of the National Capital Planning Commission. It was agreed that further studies would be made and the plan and design submitted at a later meeting of the Commission.

b) Gallaudet College Speech and Hearing Clinic

Mr. John W. McLeod of McLeod and Ferrara, Architects, explained the design and sketches for the one-story circular structure to be used as a speech and hearing clinic at Gallaudet College. After viewing the design and discussing the details of the sketches, the members approved the design as submitted.

Public Buildings Service (continued)

c) Gallaudet College Science and Classroom Building

Mr. William Denton, Architect, presented the drawings and plans for the Science and Classroom Building at Gallaudet College, which contains in addition to classrooms, two lecture halls and a laboratory. The members of the Commission believed that the building as designed was out of character with other buildings on the campus. They recommended that the design be restudied and revised drawings be submitted at a later meeting.

d) Department of State Annex-Exterior Courts

Mr. Thomas S. Estes, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State; Mr. T. Clifford Noonan, Architect of Graham, Anderson, Probst & White; and Mr. Arthur H. H. Messing, Architect, and Mr. Malcolm R. Stirton, Designer of Harley, Ellington and Day, joined the meeting for the discussion on the courts for the State Department Annex.

Mr. Noonan presented the revised design and sketches for the exterior courts in the Department of State Annex. The members of the Commission were pleased with the designs of the courts as submitted and gave them their approval.

Mr. Stirton then discussed the possibility of selecting a sculptor to do the two screens and the sculpture for the courts. He said that he had written to Mr. Walker Hancock and Mr. James Haseltine. It was agreed, after discussion, that the Public Buildings Service would pursue the matter further with Mr. Bertoia and Mr. Fredericks in an effort to arrive at some decision.

National Capital Planning Commission

Co-Ordinating Committee

Representation of Commission of Fine Arts on Co-ordinating Comittee

Mr. Harland Bartholomew, Chairman, Mr. John A. Remon, Vice Chairman, and Brig. Gen. Thomas A. Lane, Member, National Capital Planning Commission attended the meeting. It was agreed that in order to effect a closer working procedure in the solution of mutual projects, the National Commission of Fine Arts, at the invitation of the National Capital Planning Commission, would appoint a representative to be an optional member of the Co-Ordinating Committee of the Planning Commission. It was moved and approved that the Secretary be asked to serve on this Committee. During the discussion, the functions and effectiveness of the Commission of Fine Arts were commented on at considerable length. Exhibit G

Freer Gallery of Art

In accordance with the usual custom, the Commission visited the Freer Gallery of Art, where the Director, Mr. Wenley, submitted a number of works of art proposed for purchase. The Commission was pleased to inspect the objects and approved them for purchase. Exhibit H.

Meeting adjourned at 4:45 o'clock.

L. R. Wilson
Secretary

APPENDIX 1

4. REPORT OF ACTION TAKEN ON SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT APPLICATIONS SINCE 24 JANUARY MEETING:

SL 1947 1115 Pa. Ave., NW (31"x51"x4" glass & aluminum showcase & 1 27"x37", 3-color painted masonite sign to go inside showcase) for Raleigh Hotel, Inc. Approved, recommend placing sign in a less cramped space & in better harmony with architecture of bldg., 2/26/57.

SL 1950 224 East Capitol St., NE (Remodel front of bldg.-add elevator- repair exterior stairs-new interior part'ns.-new toilet rm.-remove ext. coach house & porch) Ref'd. for determination of Fine Art's jurisdiction, 1/22/57. FINAL ACTION: 1/28/57, Mrs. Dudley said 224 East Capitol St. NE was not under CFA's jurisdiction.

SL 1951 506 Md. Ave., SW (1 single-faced, 24 sq-ft painted sign) for Gulf Oil Co. App., 1/30/57.

SL 1952 615 Pa. Ave., NW (2 tempo. construction signs; both single-faced) for IBM Vanguard Comp. Approved for tempo. signs, provided size of both signs is reduced to total approx. 25 sq-ft, 2/8/57.

SL 1953 615 Pa. Ave., NW (Provide new front on bldg., revise interior part'ns., install air cond. system) for IBM Vanguard Comp. Approved, 2/8/57.

SL 1954 303-7th St., NW (2 single-faced signs, green alum. letters aginst alum. facade) for Fireman's Ins. Co. Approved provided total sign area does not exceed 25-sq-ft, 2/8/57.

SL 1955 1615 H St., NW (Install wires & porcelain stand off posts along ledge to birdproof bldg) for Chamber of Commerce of the U. S. App., 2/8/57.

SL 1956
R 1916 1337 E St., NW (Rev. to bldg. permit B-18968 to change location of driveway) for Auto Center Inc. Facade approved as revised on drawing dtd. 1/31/57, 2/14/57.

SL 1957 1911 Parkside Dr., NW (1-story, brick & stone dwelling) for Brill & Peck, Builders. App; recom. that stone treatment on front wall be carried short distance around corner on side wall as verbally described to the builder, 3/1/57.

SL 1958 2801 Chesterfield Pl., NW (Ret. walls) for Thelma Churner Mucker. App., 2/26/57.

SL 1959 2801 Chesterfield Pl., NW (6' cedar sapling fence) for T. C. Mucker. App., 2/26/57.

SL 1960 2801 Chesterfield Pl., NW (Landscape grounds) for T. C. Mucker. App., 2/26/57.

Exhibit A

APPENDIX A

13. SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT SUBMISSIONS - Formal:

SL 1961 111 Indep. Ave., SE (1 24-sq-ft, single-faced, illuminated; existing sign to be removed) for Congressional Camera Shop.

SL 1962 1605 No. Portal Dr., NW (Rev. to permit B-19768 to include 8" brick wall & 2x2 steel columns in lieu of wrought iron-rails & wood posts) for Dr & Mrs A. B. Coleman.

SL 1963 601 New Hampshire Ave., NW (5-story office building) for Peoples Life Insurance Co.

SL 1964 1929 K St., NW (5-story office bldg. 24' wide entrance steps will project 17' beyond bldg. line) for Associated General Contractors of America.

SL 1965 6700 Oregon Ave., NW (1-story, single family dwelling; brick & solid concrete block ret. wall) for Mr & Mrs R. E. Parker.

PENDING:

SL 1825 230-22nd St., NW (3-story office bldg.) for National Assn. of Life Underwriters. Held for revised design.

SL 1938 403-10th St., NW (1 25-sq-ft, single-faced, gold neon sign) for Tanen Sales Co. Returned at the request of Director, Department of Licenses and Inspections, D. C. Government, for determination of CFA's jurisdiction, 1/22/57.

APPENDIX B

b. REPORT OF ACTION TAKEN ON OLD CONSTRUCTION AND ALTERATIONS SINCE 24 JANUARY 1957 MEETING:

NO	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT	ACTION
1737	1576-33rd St., NW Natalie R. Montgomery	2-story addn. to existing dwelling	App., subject to making mateng. windowpanes same dimensions as adjacent window; window opening to be 3 lights high, 2/5/57
1742	1672-32nd St., NW Ferreol Ledesto	Build rear addn. & make alterations	App., 1/29/57
1743	1724 Misc. Ave., NW Friden Co.	1st STAGE: Addn. to bldg., remove exist. front of house, lot 291; rebuild as shown on draw'gs. Extend fronts on lots 295 & 296. 2ND STAGE: to be carried out as soon as lease expires (bldg. on lot 295) in August, 1957.	App. revised drawings dtd. 2/12/57, 19 Feb. 1957
1744 & 1733 (& 1349)	1564-33rd St., NW Frederick Allman	Rev. to permit B-6400 (GC 1733) to rearrange bathrms. & install new window & skylight	Accepted for record purposes, 1/29/57
1745 & 1734 (& 1349)	1556-33rd St., NW Frederick Allman	Rev. to permit B-6401 (GC 1734) to rearrange bathrms, install skylight, new dormer window	Accepted for record purposes, 1/29/57
1746	3131 M St., NW Decor Associates, Inc.	1 single-face, 22 sq-ft, black & white sign	App., 1/29/57
1747	1564-33rd St., NW Frederick Allman	Area walls & 3'-6" high wrought iron rail to extend 3' beyond bldg. line; 10'-6" wide.	App., 1/29/57
1748 & 1625	1015 Misc. Ave., NW Richard J. Donohoe (office bldg.)	Rev. bldg. permit B-13452 to install nonbearing part'ns. & chg. doors & omit windows in rear wall, & install cooling tower in rear yard.	App., 1/29/57
1749	3200 M St., NW J. F. O'Donnell	Remove show window on Misc. Ave. side to original bldg. line (fill in door openings on M St., side) make interior rev's.	App., 1/29/57
1750	1530-32nd St., NW Patricia A. Ferguson	2' to 2'-6" brick & concrete retaining wall; 5'-6" sapling fence; 6'-6" brick fence	App., 2/5/57

Exhibit C

APPENDIX 2 (Continued)

#	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT	ACTION
1751	1522-32nd St., Nw Dorothy H. Ferguson	6'-6" sapling fence on south & rear line	App., 2/5/57
1752	1526-32nd St., Nw Paul L. Pickford	6'-6" sapling fence on south & rear line	App., 2/5/57
1753	1524-32nd St., Nw Dorothy H. Ferguson	6'-6" sapling fence on south & rear line	App., 2/5/57
1754	1528-32nd St., Nw Wm. H. Ferguson, Jr.	6'-6" sapling fence on south & rear line	App., 2/5/57
1755	1634 Wisc. Ave., Nw Diebold, Inc.	1 single-faced, 20 sq-ft illuminated sign to be removed from 1510 H St., NW & installed at 1634 Wisc. Ave., NW	App., provided sign be placed over center window, centered between top of window & marquee, 1/29/57
1756	1525-35th St., Nw Graham Lytle	Erect 8" brick wall & steps & load on parking area 1'-7" & 7'-3" (in place)	Work completed before submission; design of work considered legally justified by cognizant Dist. authorities accepted for record purposes; completed brickwork of so. ret. wall shown in photos does not agree with drawings, 1/29/57
1757	1700 Wisc. Ave., Nw Royal Neon Corp.	1 single-faced, 20 sq-ft sign with brick posts for suspension	App., 2/5/57
1758	3524 N St., Nw Georgetown University	Remove nonbearing part'ns.; install nonbearing part'ns.; install ducts for air cond.; install 6"x6" steel columns; no plumbing (Base porch, tool shed & office)	App. for razing porch, tool shed, & office, 2/5/57
1759	1509-34th St., Nw Mary Lamberton	Replace wood stoop with concrete as per plan; no change in size or shape	App., 2/5/57
1760	1618-32nd St., Nw Mrs. Joanna Huntington Noel	6'-6" cypress cedar screen fence	App., 2/12/57

APPENDIX 2 (Continued)

NO	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT	ACTION
1761	2911 P St., NW Howard L. McVitty	Increase size of 3 windows-excavate portion of basement 18" below present fl. Replace brick piers & wood girders with steel	App., 2/12/57
1762 & 1739	1518-32nd St., NW N. Mellen	Repairs to comply with the requirements of the Condem. Board. Disap.; brick veneer faces do not in harmony with rest of bldg. as proposed. Prefer wood bevel siding indicated on draw., 2/12/57	
1763	3202 "O" St., NW Paperback Book Shop	Repaint & change copy of 1 single-faced, 10 sq-ft sign	App., 2/12/57
1764	2703 Dumbarton Ave., NW Garth Peters	Replace 2 wood front doors (6 light doors) with 9 light doors (in place)	Filed for record purposes; work completed before submission of application, 2/13/57
1765 & 1653	2808-14 R St., NW R. A. Cinnetti	Rev. bldg. permit to lower garage floor	App., 2/19/57
1766	1686-31st St., NW David Ginsburg	6'-6" sapling fence	App., 2/13/57
1767	3321 P St., NW Olga G. Foley	Install new door & window in rear elevation	App., 2/19/57
1768	3348 M St., NW American Security & Trust Co.	Remove tin & wood cornice on west side of bldg.	Ret'd. for clarification re. details of replacement & appearance of finished work, 19 Feb. 1957
1769	3075 M St., NW Food Mart	Install metal disc, nonilluminated, on stainless steel base, in exist. sign	App., 2/19/57
1770	1623-28th St., NW F. L. Belin	Build 7'-3" x 10'-10" 1-story addn. to match exist. bldg.	App., sugg. that all new windows be made same size to match exist. windows 2/19/57

APPENDIX 2 (Continued)

NO	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT	ACTION
1771	1413 Misc. Ave., NW Richard L. Fabrizio	Install new tin roof gutters & spouts, new roof sheathing where necessary	App., 2/19/57
1772	3421 "Q" St., NW Sam C. King	Make change in design of rail; cap opening in brick work under steps as indicated in red on plans	App., 2/19/57
1773	1218-31st St., NW L. P. Seibold, Inc.	Raze rear frame section of bldg.; Condemned by D. C.	App., 2/19/57
1774	1213-31st St., NW L. P. Seibold, Inc.	Install steel stairway to 2nd fl. at rear of bldg.	App., provided an additional horizontal member is added to long run of rail., 2/19/57
1775	2803-14 M St., NW M. A. Ginetti	Construct a brick retain. wall across public parking along entrances to garages, 1-foot high	App., 2/19/57
1776	3320-22 M St., NW Jack I. Hilmann (Store & Office)	Alterations as per plans (new show front)	App., 2/19/57
1777	1672-32nd St., NW Ferreol Ledentu	Raze rear frame addn. to dwelling to make rm. to build new addn. not condemned	App., 2/19/57
1778 & 1646	2500 [illegible] St., NW Carlyn Apts.	Rev. to plans to show brick cap instead of limestone cap on brick wall for garage addn.	App., 2/25/57
1779	1725 Misc. Ave., NW Lolie & Waverly Dickson	Raze dwelling in entirety, not condem. (See OC 1743 for replacement)	App., 2/25/57
1780	3123 Dumbar. Ave., NW Mr. & Mrs. Gilbert C. Greenway	Erect 1-story masonry toilet-room addition	App., 2/26/57
1781	1513-33rd St., NW Karl Wagner	6'-6" sapling fence	App., 2/25/57
1782	3611 "Q" St., NW J. S. Beggs, Inc.	6'-6" sapling fence	App., 2/25/57
1783	3103 Dumbar. Ave., NW Mrs. M. J. Coolidge	Build rear addn. as per plan & make interior alteration	App., 2/25/57

APPENDIX 2 (Continued)

NO	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT	ACTION
1784	1212-28th St., NW Mildred Lam	Replace exist. wood steps leading to basement with brick steps	App., 2/26/57
1765 R 1762 (R 1739)	1518-32nd St., NW N. Mellen	Replace wood siding by brick & correct deficiencies ordered by Board of Condemnation	Ret'd. for revis. Plns. & elevations do not agree, nor scale out, 2/26/57
1785 R.	1518-32nd St., NW N. Mellen	Replace wood siding by brick & correct deficiencies ordered by Board of Condemnation	App'd. as revised by designer on 3/7/57, 3/7/57
786	3614 Prospect St., NW Prue M. Baxter	7' board fence	Ret'd. for correct dimensions, & position of fence on plot plan, 3/5/57
1787	1529 Misc. Ave., NW Allen Mitchell Co.	2' max. brick retain. wall & 6'-6" wood fence	App., 3/5/57
1788	3200 M St., NW Rive Gauche Restaurant	5 green canvas awnings	App. provided hanger ba above awning be eliminated, 3/5/57
1789	3609 "O" St., NW Mrs. Jean D. Miller	Replace present exterior door with window to ventilate new toilet rm.	App., 3/5/57
1790	3115 "O" St., NW Mr & Mrs George Herman	Alterations & addn. to exist. dwelling	App., 3/5/57
791 R 1689	2912 "O" St., NW Graham Lytle	Rev. to B-18523 to install window & door unit on 2nd fl. & erect open porch 1 story as per revised plan	Ret'd. for determination of jurisdiction of the CFA, 3/8/57
1792	3003 "O" St., NW Graham Lytle	Install new wood siding on front from 1st fl. to cornice	App., 3/5/57
1793	3140 M St., NW The Door Store	Remove overhead garage door. Install masonry wall containing 3 doors in it.	App., provided exterior surfaces of new walls be faced with red brick 3/5/57
1795	3108 P St., NW Christian O. Herter	6'-6" wood sapling fence; increase height of exist. masonry wall to 7'	App., 3/11/57

3 April 1957

Dear General North:

The members of the Commission of Fine Arts were glad to discuss the plans and model for the East Coast Memorial which Mr. William Gehron, architect, and Mr. John Harbeson, resubmitted for their consideration at our meeting on 14 March 1957.

The general concept of the design was approved. It was suggested, however, that the scale and size of the name tablets, and their relation to the bronze eagle be restudied. The model of the eagle rising from the wave was preferred.

It was further suggested that the advice and approval of the Art Commission of the City of New York, and the Department of Parks be secured, because of the prominence this memorial will have in that city.

The Commission will be glad to confer further with you on the development of this design. The next meeting will be held on 18 April 1957, and time will be reserved for you, if you desire.

Sincerely yours,

L. M. Wilson
Secretary

Brigadier General Thomas North
Secretary
American Battle Monuments Commission
2080 Main Navy Building
Washington 25, D. C.

Exhibit D

4 April 1957

Brigadier General Thomas North
Secretary
American Battle Monuments Commission
2060 Main Navy Building
Washington 25, D. C.

Dear General North:

The members of the Commission of Fine Arts were glad to discuss the revised plans for the West Coast Memorial, which Mr. John Harbeson re-submitted for their consideration at our meeting on 14 March 1957.

The general idea of the monument was approved, after the changes made in the original sketch had been noted. The general opinion, however, was that the relationships of the various parts of the monument and the sculptural motives could best be developed and studied in model form.

It is hoped that such a model can be prepared, and further conferences can be held on the development of this important project. The next meeting of the Commission will be held on 18 April 1957, and time will be reserved for you then, if you desire.

Sincerely yours,

L. R. Wilson
Secretary

Exhibit E

3 May 1957

Mr. Gerard I. Sawyer, Chief
Office of Planning, Design
and Engineering
Department of Highways
400-A District Building
Washington 4, D. C.

Dear Mr. Sawyer:

During the course of the last three meetings of the Commission of Fine Arts on 24 January, 14 March, and 18 April 1957, the members have met with you and your representatives to discuss the preliminary designs which are being prepared for the nine highway structures required for the Anacostia Freeway. At each of the meetings, perspective drawings were presented for study as follows:

1. Overpass at Pennsylvania Avenue.

2. Underpass at Eleventh Street Interchange.

3. Overpass at Oxen Run Bay Bridge.

4. Overpass at Suitland Parkway Interchange.

5. Overpass at Chesapeake Avenue.

In each instance, minor suggestions were made which your architect, Mr. Joseph Tormey, said would be incorporated into the final drawings. All the projects were approved in principle as presented, except the Pennsylvania Avenue Overpass. In this instance, the members of the Commission considered that the design appeared cramped and the relation of the abutments to the sidewalk gave a constricted impression which was undesirable in connection with this important radial avenue in the plan of the Nation's Capital. It was our impression that the design would be restudied and resubmitted.

The members of the Commission asked me to tell you that they found it difficult to relate the various structures to the overall plan for the Freeway, since no general layout of the entire system of roadways was presented. They hope that an overall plan can be shown in conjunction with the next designs that are presented.

Exhibit F

Mr. Gerard I. Sawyer 3 May 1957

The next meeting of the Commission will be held 23 May 1957, and time will be set aside for you to present designs for (a) Anacostia Freeway Bridge at Portland Street; (b) Railroad Bridge and Viaduct, east of Second Street to and including treatment of South Capitol Street.

Sincerely yours,

L. R. Wilson
Secretary

and I think it is very rare that anything would happen that Mr. Wilson would be interested in.

(Mr. Harland Bartholomew, Mr. John A. Remon, and Mr. John Nolen enter the Conference Room)

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: We are glad to have an opportunity to meet you and talk over the nature of our problems. I think the thing we particularly want to discuss first is the Executive Order. We would like to have your ideas as to what you think we can accomplish by the Order.

MR. BARTHOLOMEW: I would say, first, that the matter hasn't been given an extremely thorough consideration, as it was discussed at our meeting a week or so ago. The suggestion was made by General Lane, at the meeting,-and I think possibly, shared by one or two of the other members,- that there might be a little clearer expression here, since there seemed to be some overlapping of the Commissions' jurisdiction, which under the Planning Commission, has to do with location; I am not, perhaps, too well prepared to discuss the matter, other than to say that the Commission thought we should explore it further with you and with your Commission.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Well, as you know, in the prior years, when this Commission was the only Commission in existence, we dealt in things like that, and the Planning Commission was established to take care of the public roads,

but it didn't take care of public buildings, et cetera.

We are discussing the Executive Order and what could be accomplished by it, and what it should cover. Do you want to say something?

(General Thomas A. Lane enters the Conference Room)

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I was just saying, when the Commission of Fine Arts was established, and for a good many years later, it dealt with a good many problems that are now dealt by the Planning Commission. Later, when the Planning Commission was established, they took over the planning of the city, et cetera. The Commission of Fine Arts shares with the National Capital Planning Commission responsibility for advising as to sites of monuments or buildings, and in other matters that affect the appearance of the City of Washington, so we do have responsibility under the Act and Executive Orders. I have one or two of the last Executive Orders before me now, and what concerns us is that we do not want to avoid exercising formally our duty in those situations.

Now, it may be we can clarify it. I think we understand each other's fields very well. We are directly across the hall, and we know pretty well what each other does. I thought it would be a good idea if the Fine Arts Commission were represented on the Coordinating Committee,

so we would know what is coming up. Very often we read in the newspapers of things that actually affect us.

MR. BARTHOLOMEW: I would say, first, that the duties of the Planning Commission are rather carefully set out in the law. You remember the Bureau of the Budget went pretty thoroughly into the reorganization of our law, or the rephrasing of it, and our Act was redrawn and passed by Congress in about 1952, and I am sure that the wording of that Act does not in any sense overlap any of the functions of the Fine Arts Commission. Further, we have the greatest of sympathy, as you know, with your work, and we endeavor to cooperate with your Commission. Whenever we have matters of mutual interest, we have asked you to meet with us.

So far as representation on the Coordinating Committee is concerned, I think that it would be entirely appropriate for you to be represented there. The only other question I think that remains is whether the language of this proposed Executive Order may leave an area of uncertainty with respect to the phraseology of our Act, and that is the question that was raised in our Commission by two or three of our members. I think, perhaps, it might be well if General Lane, whom, I believe, has looked into this a bit, and who is particularly concerned about the situation in the District Government, ~~if he~~ would say

a word about this.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Would you say something about it?

GENERAL LANE: I gave a memorandum to the Planning Commission to the effect that this Executive Order has been reported to the Executive Committee. It has not taken action with the Bureau of the Budget because of press of other matters in our Corporation Counsel's Office.

From my own examination of the bill, it seemed to me that all the purposes of the Fine Arts Commission, and all the objectives of the Fine Arts Commission, will be met with our present procedures, and an Executive Order at this time would not be necessary or desirable.

I say, of course, from the point of view of the District Government, that we very much appreciate the services of the Fine Arts Commission. I think we are referring more things to you than are required to by law at the present time, because we look on your body as a very valuable one to the city and to all of us.

There is a question, which I am sure you are aware, of from the pressing problems of planning procedure here, whether the multiple review of planning in all its aspects by the Planning Commission and the Fine Arts Commission, would not add an undesirable delay to the procedure; and if, at the present time, the Planning

Commission is bringing in the Fine Arts Commission in all matters affecting it, giving it an opportunity to express its views, it would appear that the objectives of having the advice of both bodies might by such a procedure be carried out. That is how we have been proceeding in the past, and I think it would be desirable to proceed that way in the future.

I understand that you have been exercised or concerned about the picking of a site for the bridge. It is true that in picking a site, no reference was made to the Fine Arts Commission. It goes to the National Planning Commission for objective approval, and then it goes to the Fine Arts Commission for your approval. In this aspect, you should have been considered in the primary stages. I think the Planning Commission should have brought you in. If we failed to do that, it was an oversight.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I think the selection of the site for the bridge is an important thing. In some other place, the Fine Arts Commission wouldn't have been so much interested, but in that situation, it was very much interested. We certainly do not want to do the city planning in the sense of traffic, or all that sort of thing. That must be handled by your Commission -- but where it does affect the appearance of the city, we are interested.

Suppose some plan is adopted that would affect the

situation of traffic. There we have a definite responsibility, and it is a responsibility on the part of all the federal and district officials to consult first with the Fine Arts Commission before any action is taken.

You are familiar with the Executive Order of 1921, which is very comprehensive, if it is complied with in all cases. In the case of parks, before any action is taken that would change the nature of the public parks in the District, so far as it affects the appearance of the City, that is something that interests us, and under the law, we may advise on it. After we have given advice, you can ignore it, but that is your responsibility, and the responsibility of the official concerned, but we must be consulted.

I think, in most things, we get along very well. What really concerns us is, we are not doing our duty if we are not given an opportunity to advise and consider it carefully before action is taken, and that is a thing that might arise and bring about some very serious results some day.

GENERAL LANE: I think that is true, and if we had a liaison between the Park Commission and Mr. Wilson, and as the Park Commission is bringing in matters that you are interested in bringing before the Fine Arts Commission, I think it would be very desirable for Mr. Wilson to have a membership on that committee, so he may attend all meetings.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I don't want to have anything to do with matters about which we have no concern, and certainly we would not. Mr. Thompson and Mr. Wilson could listen, but only be really interested in things that would affect the Commission of Fine Arts. We read in the papers of things that are done, so we do hear about them. We understand that there is to be a street cut through that park. We only heard about that in the newspaper. Should not the Fine Arts Commission be consulted about that before action is taken?

GENERAL LANE: I don't know. I believe the language says, "On important projects that affect the appearance of the City of Washington."

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: The Executive Order of 1921 reads as follows:

"It is hereby ordered that essential matters relating to the design of medals, insignia and coins ..."

(The Executive Order of 1921 was read)

That is still in force.

GENERAL LANE: That is right. There is a serious question whether the planning of this park could be in any-way influenced by the advice of your Commission, but I would be glad to refer it to you and receive your advice if you want it that way. I would be glad to have you pass on this park.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: That is a very minor question, but suppose it was on the Mall?

GENERAL LANE: That is in the portfolio of your Commission, that all important matters should be related to you. The implication is that minor questions are not. If you consider that this is an important matter, we would be glad to have you effect it. We could not see how the Fine Arts Commission in anyway could be affected by the design of this area. We had the advice of the Park Service in the development of this planning. None of the monuments are disturbed in anyway. There is a little plot of land here, and a little plot of land here, but I didn't think it was a matter in which the Fine Arts Commission would be interested.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: This is a matter that relieves traffic, but I don't think you can say, "This is important, or not important." The order says:

(The Executive Order was read)

Anything that has to do with parks is important. Anything that has to do with the public domain in the City is important. I know you are familiar with New York City and the vigilance with which Robert Moses tends to the parks there, and I think that someone should tend to the parks here.

GENERAL LANE: Mr. Moses is Director of Parks in

the City of New York, and his decision influences the Board of Estimates. We have no Director of Parks in the District of Columbia.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: It is our duty to give you our advice on parks, and you can ignore it then. We have very good cooperation, but I think it is important that everybody should understand what our duties are, and it is necessary as long as these Executive Orders state that they should consult the Fine Arts Commission about a bridge, and, of course, a park.

GENERAL LANE: It was my understanding that everyone in the Commission was aware of the discussion about the bridge. We agreed formally, and referred to -- I don't know whether we did have a joint meeting with our Commission?

MR. REMON: There was a meeting in July, and an agreement was reached at that meeting to support a bridge at New Hampshire Avenue. Within the week, that was changed to Constitution Avenue, rather than the New Hampshire proposal. The Planning Commission indorsed the action of the conferees, so to speak, and within the week Congress had passed the legislation, at the end of the session. It happened just like that.

I don't think anybody realized, and I know I did not realize that the Fine Arts Commission had not been brought

into the proposal. It was a case of trying to get everybody together.

GENERAL LANE: I think the Fine Arts Commission's position in the general conception of putting a bridge in this area was well known, and the decision was not taken in the absence of the Fine Arts Commission. It was taken in the full knowledge of your Commission. Your advice had been sought, and a discussion was had before this compromise was reached, ~~and~~ your opposition was well known.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Our opposition was to a high-level bridge, but beyond that, I don't remember any statement that the Commission gave.

MR. ORR: It was before my time. Certainly, ~~we~~ did not consider Constitution Avenue, because that ~~didn't enter~~ anybody's mind.

MR. PEETS: Wasn't that the critical moment when ~~the~~ Senator was formulating this bill for the bridge that would cover the island, ~~and~~ the question was whether this Commission was represented at that hearing?

GENERAL LANE: Apparently, it wasn't. If you had been represented at that meeting, you might have expressed an opinion about the possible bridge sites, although you were opposed to all of them. Actually, of course, it would have been better if the Chairman of the Fine Arts Commission had been present.

MR. BARTHOLOMEW: I came into it in the middle of the discussion. The first proposal was that there be a bridge over Roosevelt Island, coming into E Street. Was that ever before the Fine Arts Commission? Did you ever take action on that?

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Yes, we expressed opposition to that.

MR. BARTHOLOMEW: You did?

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Yes, and on New Hampshire Avenue. We expressed our opposition to that? Is that correct?

MR. WILSON: Yes.

MR. BARTHOLOMEW: This one was a facet of this. It was an alternate location of the same idea of a bridge in that same location. Of course, that does raise the question of whether it did come back to you, since it was an obvious shift. I am trying to analyze your interpretation of that. You had taken action in opposing the bridge in any of that area.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: We didn't say, "In any of that area."

MR. PEETS: The critical action was the action of this Commission, which was against any bridge over the island; and so the people who wanted a bridge, objected, that the bridge come across at an angle, extending New

Hampshire Avenue, which means they would avoid touching Roosevelt Island. That was the point, to which, I think, we were not sufficiently represented at that hearing.

GENERAL LANE: Our compromise was strictly in line to avoid Roosevelt Island.

MR. PEETS: The result was catastrophic. That is where our active opposition came in. It wound up in getting the approval of the Roosevelt Association, ~~for their approval~~ to go across the island.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I think we were very late in coming into the situation, but we were able to avoid a very unpleasant situation. We said, we got the Roosevelt Association to agree to put a ~~bridge~~ very low over the island, rather than south ~~of the area~~ near Memorial Bridge. It is an instance of what the Commission of Fine Arts can do and should do.

GENERAL LANE: The difficulty is that we don't have a Commission over Roosevelt Island. ~~We don't have the authority of Congress~~.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: That ~~was~~ unfortunately, legislative action, but the whole matter is up again, and ~~we~~ have an opportunity to consider what ~~they~~ want to do. I think it is a very serious matter, and I think thorough consideration should be given to it. I think, in a case of such great importance, that the Commission of Fine Arts should be

brought into it at the very beginning.

GENERAL LANE: I think that some of our citizens think that five years is too long to consider the matter.

MR. BARTHOLOMEW: I have gone through 25 years of the Commission, and even though you weren't advised, you know there is enough information in the newspapers to keep you informed about what is going on.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: We are talking about legal procedures, and it isn't a legal procedure to read in the papers what people are going to do. There is an Executive Order, and, under the law, the Fine Arts Commission can pass on such sites. If there hadn't been such an insistence to put a bridge in such a place, it would have been passed long ago.

MR. BARTHOLOMEW: I think that technically the matter should have been brought back to you, but you were opposed to crossing the island.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: At the high level.

MR. BARTHOLOMEW: After they passed one going south of the island, they technically should have come back to you.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Yes.

MR. BARTHOLOMEW: The proposal is to go down over the south end of the island, which brings it back in the sphere of the action already taken; so, whether it should

have come back to you, I am trying to figure what the strict interpretation of the law is now. Is Congress supposed to make this reference? No, it is the Executive Department which makes the reference. ~~It was~~ after the passage of the legislation.

MR. PEETS: In the long ~~angle~~ group across the river, that bill, as written by Senator Case, required that matters connected with the location of the bridge should be referred to the Planning Commission, and in matters concerned with the architectural design and monuments, they should be referred to the Fine Arts Commission. Since, in the case of a bridge, the architectural features include the location, it should be referred to the Fine Arts Commission.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: We don't need anything referred to us. We are thoroughly familiar with the situation. The President, thought no trucks should go over ~~there~~. It was an impossible situation.

MR. ORR: Don't you think, basically, what we are aiming at is to pass on things that have to do with the appearance of Washington? That is one instance. The other ~~is that it~~, in my opinion, is too small for the project that has been ~~provided~~. We have to accept ~~what~~ is selected, or at least for the moment, unless we clarify this and have no opportunity to express an opinion, except on a structure that can be applied to the site.

I think the State Department is concerned that the site is too small for the structure that is put there to provide for their own program. I think that is what we are driving at. We have to express an opinion if we are, supposedly, to pass on the appearance of Washington, and if we are not involved in the selection of the location, we cannot complete our obligation, because we have passed on the structure.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: We have talked only with Mr. ~~Sorells~~ Searles and the architect about it. I don't think anything official has been referred to us. That is something that will very greatly affect the appearance of the city. I think that should have been referred to the Commission of Fine Arts.

MR. PERRY: I think it concerns us all personally. What we want to do is help. I can help. I know what the definition of work is, and that is defining the word "duty". We haven't insisted upon our duty. We don't say, "How well we have done our duty," nor am I attempting to educate the Chairman,-but what I would like to see is a subdivision of duties, ~~one~~, that is, a division of organization. I would say that a situation I would prefer to work under is that everybody from the Executive down is aware that the National Capitol is the National Capitol. From that, comes all kinds of descriptions, which shall not be treated as a

catastrophe, but in terms and in an intelligent way, to adapt it to the needs without making it a target. That is a little rough, but it isn't aiming at the higher people.

If we could work out a definition that is implied by the first paragraph, then I think that everything that the Fine Arts Commission is doing or attempting to do would seem logical, and I turn,-if I may,-much more to an acccenting of this word "duty". I think we do not want to emphasize that because it sounds like a virtue, and we don't want to emphasize our own ~~vitures~~ virtues. I am not sure we have any.

I see no percentage in negation,-none whatever,-except that when we say "no", you won't be anxious at all. I say that things never get to that point where a negation is necessary. No member of the Fine Arts Commission is against anything, but they want to provide an alternative.

That bridge affects my own and other architects, because the bridge is an accomplished fact. I should say that the time element is a fact in our minds in the consideration of that. Fifty years or one hundred years from now the Constitution Avenue bridge will be a supplement; that there are ways of using a circumferential plan here, and not increasing our load of protection. I think I will stop right there.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I think we all agree with what

Mr. Perry has said. We don't want to increase our authority beyond what we have now. We only want to be helpful. There is talent here this morning. Mr. Perry arrived this morning from Boston. Mrs. Muir is here from Maine. They gave two days of their time to advising the Government. It is a voluntary thing; to give their best advice, and that advice is very useful to the Government, and we would like to have an opportunity to do that. The Fine Arts Commission is concerned with aesthetic matters that would affect the City of Washington. We are the only government agency that is authorized by Congress to pass on aesthetic matters that would affect the structures and monuments of Washington.

You have to pass on traffic conditions, schools, roads, all that sort of thing, but in matters of aesthetics, whether a bridge is beautiful in design or location, those are matters that are the duty of the Fine Arts Commission to advise on, as given us by Congress, and I would think it would be very helpful for all concerned for us to be consulted; and you have the wonderful position of not having to take that advice. You can ignore it.

GENERAL LANE: I certainly agree with you gentlemen, and the element of time, the factor of which you spoke, and not taking a negative attitude or position certainly goes to that. It is important that all the agencies be concerned about the development of the City of Washington,

and work together. I think you have lost the element of time when you go ahead with your planning. I think you have to look ahead. We are going to have to go to Congress and buy land so you will have it. I think you should have that kind of a program so that you have a place to put a building. I think in the City of Washington we have exhausted the planning of 1901, and we are not looking far enough ahead to take up the needs of today.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I think that is true of the traffic situation. We have gone about it piecemeal.

MR. PEETS: I don't think that adequate provisions have been made to take care of the people who come to the City of Washington to work. There are also a vast number of people who come into town in their cars and have no place to park. That does not concern us, but the traffic situation should be worked out. You should have some rapid transit that goes across the river. Thirty years from now, you will have that, but that should be planned.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I once had a man at this table who said, "I think it would be a very good parking place south of the Mall." Suppose that would be done. How could you recover the City of Washington 25 or 50 years from now? That is our business to protect that. It take a long time to build the City of Washington and make a beautiful city, ~~out of it~~, but you can destroy it in fifty years.

MR. HARRISON: It seems to me that instead of scrapping, ~~together,~~ we should work together and make this particular plan that the General is talking about come true. We should be in there, fighting for the aesthetic, artistic side, pushing this as much as we can, to help in the future planning. It seems to me that someone from our group could be working on that basis.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: We do that a great deal. We are prepared to do ~~that~~ more.

GENERAL LANE: As I see the action of the Commission on the E Street Bridge, you ~~are taking~~ the position here that ~~you~~ could not cross Roosevelt Island. You ~~say,~~ "It ~~is going to~~ be south or north of the island," and they went south of the island, which you thought was more ~~objective~~ than across it.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: We took that position, because we had a visitor from the Roosevelt Island Trustees who said there was no legal power to invade Roosevelt Island and the Government had an obligation to observe it. Later, we talked to the Roosevelt Island Trustees and secured their permission to go over the island.

GENERAL LANE: That is what Congress respected, and if the Fine Arts Commission had been consulted a week before Congress adjourned, nobody could have changed the Roosevelt Island situation, and the legislation would have

gone through as it did, even though the Fine Arts Commission had taken part in it.

If you had taken a different attitude at the beginning, we might have worked out a different situation. That could have been avoided by taking it east of Roosevelt Island, earlier.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: What I am trying to say is that the action of the Commission in the case of the bridge has had a salutary affect, and is not just a matter of delays and obstructions. We recommended the need for crossing it. We consulted the designers as to the design of the bridge, and if you had had the legal permission to go ahead, I presume the bridge would have been under way now. It was no fault of the Fine Arts Commission to delay it five years.

GENERAL LANE: I didn't attribute that to you. I think we were discussing planning in general. This has been going on for a long time.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I think Mr. Harrison's idea is very good. I think we should stop arguing and try and get the building built.

GENERAL LANE: There is one thing I haven't mentioned here, which I think is very important. This is the National Capitol, but it seems to me that it isn't practical at all to try and control all the building

development in the City of Washington, in the District of Columbia. We have to try and define the areas in which we are concerned about the designs, not the monumental areas along Constitution Avenue, and all that new general extension of the authority of this commission over architecture in the city was left indefinite in the realm of building. That you have control would certainly create undue confusion, and it isn't clear from the language here whether you want that control over all the buildings in town, or whether you were satisfied with the bill, assigning jurisdiction in the monumental areas.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: We don't want control over the commercial buildings in the City of Washington as it relates to the Federal area, but if someone would want to put a twenty or thirty story building within the area of the Capitol, we would be very concerned.

MR. BARTHOLOMEW: I don't think that is a very valid criticism. This says, "Plans and proposed locations for new public buildings." That doesn't include all the buildings in town.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: We have no desire to have any responsibility about any of the other buildings in Washington.

MR. BARTHOLOMEW: No. 3 says, "Plans for removal, preservation, et cetera, of existing public buildings."

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: That would be the Patent Office.

MR. REMON: As to the Redevelopment Land activities, it would control these private construction projects to a large extent.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: It wouldn't the private building, but the over-all planning that affects the City ~~in that area,~~ is the only thing we would be interested in.

MR. REMON: The Redevelopment Land Agency buys the land and it goes into private hands unless the Government wants a part of it.

MR. BARTHOLOMEW: We cannot buy all the land bordering the Mall. Some of it is going to be privately owned. Then what? I am wondering if we couldn't get closer to this by a definition, which may involve control of certain districts, rather than taking redevelopment projects as a whole. For instance, ~~right~~ at the moment we have about one thousand acres ~~for~~ a proposed Redevelopment Project in the Northwest District. It affects no public buildings whatsoever, ~~and~~ I can see what Mr. Remon had in mind when he said that under the law, ~~agencies~~ might acquire the land and sell it. True, they go pretty far in the setting up ~~of~~ the kind of a project that the public wants, ~~and~~ there is debate among the technical groups as to how far they should go, but even so, it doesn't go beyond the scope, so I think this possibly should be scanned a little

more closely legally, and I am not clear, not having had occasion to participate in this matter of the control of structures around the White House and the Mall. That was the Shipstead-Luce Act.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: The Shipstead-Luce Act, yes.

MR. BARTHOLOMEW: How far does that go?

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: The Shipstead-Luce Act provides that buildings along the river: (Read the Act).

MR. BARTHOLOMEW: Wouldn't it be well to have it redefined on the action you take here?

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: We are advised to take action on the Georgetown Act and the Shipstead-Luce Act, and they are headaches to the Fine Arts Commission. We have managed to get three advisory architects to come here and go over these applications, Tuesday afternoon, and they are a complete headache. It is very clear about the Shipstead-Luce Act.

MR. BARTHOLOMEW: Even the Shipstead-Luce Act isn't very clear when they speak about redevelopment when it faces the Mall. It may not face the Mall. It may be a mile away.

MR. HARRISON: We are faced with the problem of protecting the beauty of our National Capitol, as a Fine Arts Commission. You also want the same thing. Obviously, no one wants to come in here and reform it. I am the last

person on earth to be against action, or reaction, or different points of view. I don't believe in strong bipartisanship, right or wrong, but in this thing, it seems to me we are not up against this thing to spend our time in trying to stop a bridge. It is, as you say, too far in the day to come in here and upset everything. The net result is that year after year goes by and the bridge doesn't get started. That doesn't seems to me to be the creative or helpful way that we should be functioning.

Why couldn't you go over this bill and make whatever criticisms that would be helpful, and to this end, no one is grasping for more work to do. We are asking for some method in getting this thing through. As it has grown, it has become more complicated. Everyone has a stumbling block in the Executive Order.

MR. REMON: I am thoroughly convinced in my own mind that an order and a law will not accomplish what they are trying to do. We have to have the cooperation and the effective working together of the Redevelopment Land Agency, the Planning Commission, the N.P.H.A. and the Fine Arts Commission. They are all involved. We have to get it on a basis. I think the first rule would be that the Fine Arts Commission would have representation on the Coordinating Committee, and work together, and try to work these things out cooperatively.

One of our troubles at the present time is that one outfit gets the idea that we should never have a bridge at Constitution Avenue. I don't think that is the proper attitude, myself, and I have heard a very important gentleman on the Committee of One Hundred say that the Committee of One Hundred is unalterably opposed to a bridge at that particular location. 1. Do we need the bridge? 2. Is it a suitable location? 3. It is an opportunity for give and take.

I don't think you are going to get it by Executive Order, or by the law. It has to be a general get-to-gether, and there should be some of this pride of authorship, and again, on either side, I have no entanglements at all. Five years of my young life I have spent struggling with that bridge, and I have not the money to consume, and I would like to see something done. I think it can be done. We are all out for the best interests of Washington, the aesthetic, the practical, and a balancing of the two. The aesthetic cannot have it all, nor the practical have it all.

I think we would be better off without that particular order. Have a membership on the Coordinating Committee, and all the agencies will try to keep you advised as best they can, but I think the Coordinating Committee is the best spot.

MR. PERRY: I wish I could put it as well as you

do. I think we have a mutual respect for the opinion of others.

MR. REMON: I agree with that.

MR. HARRISON: The opinion of the Commission is that they want to be helpful and not destructive.

MR. REMON: I think that people are stupid who won't take advise from others who can give advice, and I think the Fine Arts Commission is qualified to give advice.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: The Commission is here to give their advice on work that is important aesthetically to the City of Washington, not on the running of the City of Washington.

MR. BARTHOLOMEW: May I suggest this? First, so far as my Commission is concerned, I am confident that they would recommend that you have a representative on the Coordinating Committee. Secondly, I can assure you that our staff will be instructed to have your Secretary or your Chairman represented whenever we have matters up that are of vital concern to you, and that is in the first stage. Thirdly, we will ask our counsel to scan this language to reconcile it insofar as we see that it has any relationship to our organic act; and let us have your opinion in respect to that. I don't think we can accomplish any more than that.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I would be very grateful if you

would do that.

MR. ORR: you are now working on plans to have 1901 revised for '34, '39, or some other time, and say, "Here is the plan for the next fifty years?"

MR. BARTHOLOMEW: We have been giving a little thought to that. Some of us have at least, and the 1901 Act dealt very largely with the central areas of the city, and I presume, that is what we are chiefly concerned with today. It isn't a question of merely building public buildings. It is a question of how the surroundings of our public building area shall be developed in harmony, and I don't think it is alone a question of approving designs. That is rather negative in its approach, and at a meeting recently with the Board of Trade, at which I spoke, I mentioned the redevelopment of areas around the central areas. There are four or five of them. One forms this northwest area, which does touch, or at least it should come down to the northwest edge of our building; Foggy Bottom; the surroundings of the Capitol; and the southwest, which is pretty well along now, but there may be some unfinished areas there, and I have not presented this to the Commission, and would be glad to consider any thoughts you may have on the matter, but it seems to me that if we could have some funds to develop all the redevelopment that surrounds this central area, that might not be a 1901

plan, but at least it would go a long way to resolve our immediate difficulties. You might give it some thought and let us have your suggestions, and perhaps we could go to Congress and ask for the funds that may be needed.

MR. HARRISON: If the Fine Arts Commission considered the problem, it would seem to me very important for us to jointly go with the other interested bodies and back up the need for money for the proper planning for this area; and in that way, we could be helpful, rather than just hindering it. It should be a joint group and say that the fine arts are essential for the development of the area. Where those things are important, we should be working together.

MR. BARTHOLOMEW: It is a different and more complicated problem than it was in 1901. For example, the whole existence of our downtown area is threatened by the great dispersal of our Federal Agencies. That is a very important matter, so that any redevelopment we undertake ought to emphasize keeping as many of the Federal Agencies as we can in this area.

One of the things that one runs into and which has been a surprise to me in a way, is we cannot build certain buildings. We cannot conceive a scheme for a building to house federal agencies, because each agency has a right to develop its own plans for its own buildings,

and each agency comes in with a plan to house an agency in a building on their location. We cannot plan an area and say that a building has to go in there, as they do in Canada. In Canada, they have a very beautiful group of buildings as a unit, and they say that a department will be taken care of in there.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: In the location of the C.I.A. in Langley, Virginia, doesn't the Planning Commission have any say in that?

MR. BARTHOLOMEW: They picked a location and came to us with a specific proposal, and we took action, voting it down. Under the law, they had a right to come back. We gave them a set of reasons why we disagreed, and they have a chance to come back and express their views to us again, and we took no action afterwards. They may do what they please. When they came back to us, we had had one change in membership in our Commission, and the vote was reversed again by a five to four vote, so we had no control over their final opinions.

MR. REMON: They came over with an overriding reason that that was the location they must have.

GENERAL LANE: I think the C.I.A. is a good example of the failure of a long-range plan for the housing of these agencies. The C.I.A. came in and said, "There is no suitable site in Washington for us." They preferred

another, although they thought this was adequate for the size of the agency.

I don't suppose anybody in 1901 anticipated an agency of the magnitude of the C.I.A. coming into this area, or that the State Department would have grown up to its present size. When you come to the C.I.A., who is ready for expansion, and Congress is ready with its money, you have all the opposition of the agency, and it is almost impossible to control.

When you come to a general plan and see that our departments have increased to a size where we should have twice as much land as given in the McMillan Plan, you would be doing for the next fifty years what McMillan did for the City of Washington fifty years ago.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: It seems that you should have an Executive Order for building on sites in the federal areas, and I would be glad to see you get such an Executive Order. Could not the C.I.A. accommodate itself near the Capitol?

MR. BARTHOLOMEW: I think so.

GENERAL LANE: Coming back to your Executive Order, I think our Commission considered this at its last meeting and decided not to act, because they wanted your decision on this. I am sure that our Commission would like to have the feeling of your Commission at the next meeting. Before

that time, I think you should consider whether your objectives will not be met by having Mr. Wilson appointed on the Coordinating Committee. If Mr. Wilson is serving on the Coordinating Committee, we will have the benefit of his judgment in matters on which you are concerned, rather than to leave it to other peoples' judgment.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: If you would like that, I think we would be pleased to have a representative on the Coordinating Committee. Thank you very much for coming over. It has been very helpful.

MR. HARRISON: I think it would be very helpful if, four or five times a year, the Fine Arts Commission would invite all agencies to come here to find out what we are planning. Have the invitations come from you, as Chairman, to these people for a general review of what we have done and are doing. Maybe, twice a year, but don't do it too often.

MR. PEETS: It would give us an opportunity to bring in the various underlying projects, other than what Mr. Bartholomew mentioned, the one thousand acres of redevelopment of the Northwest, which may very well have an effect on 16th Street. Even the Southwest has a great effect on 16th Street, and 16th Street must be one street that must be kept alive.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: It is keeping them in business.

MR. HARRISON: We need a long-range plan that is agreed upon, and adopted, and changed ever so often,-maybe twice a year, but long enough so that all people involved will have it as a group, and go after it with enough money to do it. This business of our Government operating on a shoe string is foolish. I think one hundred million dollars is a small amount to spend on planning of one kind or another.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I think we can discuss this later. I think your idea is very good about having one or two meetings.

NATIONAL MONUMENT COMMISSION

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: I want to apologize for keeping you waiting so long, but we had another group, and everybody was full of conversation. We have another group immediately following you. We put them off until 11:30.

MR. THOMPSON: May I impose upon this Commission the problem that we mentioned several months ago about the lighting of the Washington Monument?

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Yes.

MR. THOMPSON: It was several months ago that we had the meeting, and our method of solving this problem was to retain a firm of lighting consultants, Clifford and David Park, who have analyzed the situation, and I have prepared a report that I would like to present to this Commission about their findings. It is very technical and highly

Commission of Fine Arts

The Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, The Commission of Fine Arts, and Miss Katharine N. Rhoades, or Mrs. Eugene Meyer, as provided in Paragraph 4 of the Codicil to the will of the late Charles L. Freer, have examined the following objects:

1 Bronze mirror, Chinese, T'ang dynasty;

1 Gold bracelet, Near Eastern, 12th century, bird design;

1 Painting, Chinese, by Ting Yün-p'êng, dated 1614, landscape;

1 Painting, Chinese, Yüan dynasty, by Ch'ien Hsüan; Yang Kuei-fei mounting a horse;

1 Painting, Chinese, Sung dynasty, attributed to Li Kung-lin; three seated figures;

1 Painting, Japanese, 16th century, by Motonobu; bird and flower design;

1 Album containing 8 paintings and 8 pages of calligraphy, Japanese, by Soami;

1 Painting, Japanese, attributed to Tsubun, A.D. 1420-1506; rocky landscape with wild geese;

1 Set of 3 paintings, Japanese, by Tosa Mitsunobu, A.D. 1545-1543; Kumano Sacred Mountains;

1 Painting, Japanese, by Soami, but signed Shiuro and sealed Kangaku; landscape with two scholars;

1 Pottery bowl, Persian, Nishapur, 10th century; large end deep, rosette in center and Kufic inscription on rim, in brown and red on white;

RECEIVED
THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
WASHINGTON, D. C.
MAR 15 1957
NOTED

1 Pottery bowl, Persian, 12th century; white, beat-raped, with relief decorations;

1 Pottery bowl, Persian, 12th century; footed, in black on white, youth on a lion;

1 Pottery bowl, Near Eastern, 12th century; large, blue, design of horseman;

1 Stone (prehnite) pi-liu-li, Chinese, Shang Dynasty; said to have been excavated at Anyang in 1943;

which have been recommended for purchase for the Freer Gallery of Art by Mr. A. G. Wenley, Director, and they hereby approve the purchase.

For the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

For the Commission of Fine Arts.

RE
THE COMM... OF FINE ARTS
WASHINGTON, D. C.
MAR 15 1957
NOTED

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
18 APRIL 1957

ORDER OF BUSINESS

9:30 a.m. 1. CONVENE, ROOM 7000 INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING.

9:32 a.m. 2. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS.

9:33 a.m. 3. DATE OF NEXT MEETING - May 23 - June ~~13~~ 27, 1957 (~~2~~)

9:35 a.m. 4. REPORT OF ACTION TAKEN ON SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT APPLICATIONS SINCE 14 MARCH 1957 MEETING (See Appendix 1).

9:40 a.m. 5. REPORT OF ACTION TAKEN ON OLD GEORGETOWN ACT APPLICATIONS SINCE 14 MARCH 1957 MEETING (See Appendix 2).

9:50 a.m. 6. REPORT ON LIGHTING OF WASHINGTON MONUMENT BY MR. PEETS.

10:15 a.m. 7. SUBJECTS FOR DISCUSSION:

(a) Bridge/Tunnel status.

(b) Executive Order status.

(c) D. C. Highway Department projects:

(1) Street lights.
(2) Trees, etc.

(d) Netherlands Carillon status.

(e) National Capital Planning Commission's Committee Plan for new Plan for Washington.

(f) Star article on Plan for Washington.

(g) Jackson Place - Federal Office Building.

(h) American Institute of Architect's Centennial meeting.

(i) Commission of Fine Art's Budget for fiscal years 1959, 1960, 1961, 1962.

(j) Board of Architectural Consultants for Georgetown - Replacement of Mr. Simon.

(k) Shipstead-Luce panel - Appointment of three members.

11:00 a.m. 8. PUBLIC BUILDINGS SERVICE SUBMISSIONS:

(a) Federal Office Building 9 - Revision.

(b) Federal Office Building 6 - Preliminary.

(c) Federal Office Building 8 - Preliminary.

12:00 M 9. HERALDIC BRANCH, ARMY DEPARTMENT SUBMISSIONS-MEDALS: (Lt. Col. Jas. S. Cook, Jr.; Mr. T. H. Jones, sculptor)

(a) Dept. of State - Diplomatic Courier Service Medal.

(b) White House - Distinguished Federal Civilian Service Medal, to be awarded by the President.

12:30 p.m. 10. SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT SUBMISSION (Preliminary):

(a) Chamber of Commerce of USA - 1615 H St., NW, Proposed rear addn. (Mr. Earl V. Gauger, Mr. Leon Chatelain, architects)

12:55 p.m. RECESS

1:00 p.m. LUNCH IN SECRETARY'S DINING ROOM (Mr. Muir will be a guest)

1:55 p.m. RECONVENE, ROOM 7000 INTERIOR DEPT. BLDG.

2:00 p.m. 11. D. C. HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT SUBMISSION (Mr. Edmond Burke, Supervising Bridge Design Engineer; Mr. Francis E. Tormey, Jr., architect):

(a) Anacostia Freeway Structure at Oxen Bay.

(b) Anacostia Freeway - Suitland Park Interchange.

2:30 p.m. 12. AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION SUBMISSION (Brig. Gen. Thomas North, Secy., ABMC; Mr. John Harbeson, consulting architect): Honolulu, Hawaii Memorial.

13. SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT SUBMISSIONS-Formal-(See Appendix 3)

14. LEGISLATION: (See Appendix 4)

15. TOUR OF SITES FOR CURRENT PROJECTS:

(a) Cultural center - Foggy Bottom.
(b) National Memorial Stadium - East Capitol Street.
(c) Franklin D. Roosevelt Memorial:
  (1) Naval Observatory.
  (2) Potomac Park.
(d) Netherlands Carillon and Five Freedoms Memorial.
(e) Street lighting in D. C.